

**FDIC - JFSR 18th Annual Bank Research Conference
FinTech Session, September 7, 2018**

Nagpurnanand Prabhala

Robert H. Smith School of Business
University of Maryland, College Park

Theme: FinTech Lending

- Marketplace Lending (MPL)
- (Product-) Market Based Lending
 - New version of “Keiretsu”

MPL Historically

- Laboratory to ask good questions
 - Moral hazard, information asymmetry
 - “Soft information” overcome these
- Retail investors are lenders, sophisticated and biased
 - See pictures, text, networks, coarse ratings
 - Extract soft information
 - Price these in reasonable ways

MPL Now

- A global phenomenon, especially China
 - Rau 2018
- The 2 papers look at the U.S.,
 - Changing nature of MPL
 - What are these changes? (Balyuk et al)
 - Impact of MPL on borrowers (Chava et al)
 - Interesting questions

1. Balyuk et al

- Nice overview of Prosper evolution:
 - Changes in interest rate setting process
 - Changes in scoring model and model disclosure
 - Changes in the nature and disclosure of soft information
 - Changes in the nature of lenders in MPL
- Overall trend: institutionalization
 - Shift to securitization model
 - Can cause changes in economic outcomes.

1. Balyuk et al

- Flavor of time series results
 - Funding rates go from 24% to 98%
 - Cancellation rates go from 5% to 27%
 - Estimated loss rates trend downward
 - Actual default rates trend down then inch up
- Prosper grades (AA to HR) matter
 - Even within narrow FICO bands

1. Balyuk et al

- Models of default rates
 - Prosper gives ELRs, estimated loss rates.
 - Neither ELR nor SCOREX is sufficient statistic.
 - ELR dominates FICO in predicting defaults
- Passive investors do worse than retail investors

1. Balyuk et al

- The table on Prosper versus FICO scores is curious
 - Changes in DRs within FICO are really stark
 - e.g., 0.95% to 15.02% for 780+ FICO borrowers
 - Need story and data.
 - Story: Why? What does Prosper do exactly?
 - Data: # observations, e.g., #AA, A, ... E, in 780 FICO
 - Why they come to Prosper. At least conjectures
- Is the interest rate adjustment for risk enough?
 - Maybe changes in spread to changes in DR across ratings.

1. Balyuk et al

- Interesting narrative of platform's own strategy.
 - Securitization increases yet things become better.
 - Why? Story? Platform reputation building as originator?
 - Does the incentive to access funding dominate moral hazard?
 - Can we test or estimate a structural model?

2. Chava et al.

- Effects of borrowing from MPL
 - Credit levels of MPL borrowers
 - Defaults by MPL borrowers
 - What explains the results?
- The question is interesting.
- The data are interesting, a merge of MPL data with FICO data.

2. Chava et al.

- Many MPL borrowers consolidate debt
 - Is debt substitution a bad thing?
 - Is it surprising?
- MPL borrowers then borrow more starting $[q+1]$
 - Credit cards, but not auto, mortgage, etc.
 - Like to see focus on $[MPL + CC]$. How does this aggregate change over time?
- Borrowers default on MPL, not CC.
 - This seems to be cross-sectional. Is this an individual-level analysis?
 - if correct, why? CC defaults are perhaps more serious?

2. Chava et al.

- Post MPL default increases
 - What is it about MPL that triggers this behavior?
 - Is it selection effect of those that choose MPL?
 - Story: they go to MPL, stave off (unobservable) default, then longer term, default.
- Are post-MPL CC defaults strategic or forced?
 - Is there evidence of overconsumption?
- The IV specification
 - Instrument credit scores by MPL. Isn't MPL endogenous?
 - Maybe interact MPL with credit scores

2. Chava et al.

- I am somewhat reluctant to embrace the causal claims made here. They are perhaps unnecessary.
- k-n-n matching model rules out selection on but not within geography, i.e., unobservables.
- Do the main results reflect bad models of CC firms?
 - Why do they make these mistakes?
 - Can we say something about the CC firms?
Extensive margin?
 - What does it say about CC firm objectives, market structure, and can we do some structural inferencing about these?

(Product-) Market Based Lending

淘宝网
Taobao.com

天猫 TMALL.COM 

阿里巴巴 
Alibaba.comTM

Sales records used to give credit.
See “Digital Footprints” (Berg et al 2018)

3. Huang et al.

- Sellers on Taobao for physical goods
 - Generate digital footprints, which are scored by Ant Financial
 - Score = 380 to 680
 - Score of 480+ discontinuously more likely to get credit
- Research questions
 - Is there a fuzzy discontinuity?.
 - What is its effect?

3. Huang et al.

- A bit of an easter egg hunt to get to the economics.
- Main results
 - Access to Ant discontinuous in score at 480
 - Market share growth for those above 480
- Other things
 - Loan size and interest rate continuous in score
 - Conditional on access
 - Interest rate has curious “U” after 480
 - Almost 60% of firms don’t use credit

3. Huang et al.

- What alternative financings available to sellers?
 - Formal
 - Informal
- Does actual usage matter?
 - 60% do not use.
 - So is Ant credit really a signal? To whom and for what purpose?
 - Or does the actual use of credit matter?
- Is there a selection in who chooses to take up Ant's offer?
 - Is there a discontinuity in this variable as well?
 - Firms way above 480 have higher interest rates.

3. Huang et al.

- Credit versus growth relation is not new
 - Banerjee and Duflo (Review of Economic Studies, 2014)
- Something special about platform credit ex-ante?
 - Ant's algorithm predicts growth
 - If so, what does IV mean? Picks up unobservables?
 - Need to unpeel ML algorithm more.
- Something special about platform credit ex-post?
 - Is discipline different?
 - What about it facilitates horizontal expansion?

3. Huang et al.

- Econometric questions
 - 0/1 treatment regressed on some continuous covariates.
 - Is instrumented access continuous? Is this OK?
 - Don't have good answers. May be just expositional.
- Amplification channel intriguing and very nice
 - Credit leads to growth, leads to more credit
 - How much of it is simply the operational decision of a particular platform and set of firms?
 - More on external validity of the experiment will have more impact.

Conclusion

- Institutionalization of MPL funding
 - Models similar to securitization. Good?
 - Does less democratization in funding create more democratization in credit access? Cheaper credit?
 - Or is it just borrower shifting?
- (Product)-Market Based Lending
 - Platform exploits the digital footprints it owns.
 - Footprints are credit relevant. Nice, but surprising?
 - More insights into channels and consequences